1: Hoebel E-5 (1933) 1940 NO6 Comanche NO6

They were Mangey Coat and Atsaçi. We talked, and then they said they had come to get damages for Woman. I was surprised. I asked them which one of them had a claim on her. 627x 684

"They answered, 'We have come to you from Mexican. He was the brother of Touched With A Closed Fist and this woman is his wife.'

"I called her and asked her if she were married to another man.

" 'No,' she said. She denied having anything to do with him or wanting to have anything to do with him.

"I was satisfied. Then I turned to those two men and asked what Mexican wanted in claim.

"They answered that he wanted a certain horse I had got from a dead friend, another horse, a saddle, and a Winchester.[9]

"I told them that I would not part with that first horse. It was dear to me. I told them I would give them another just as good.

"Atsaçi answered, 'We want that horse or none.'

"I tried three times to get them to agree on another horse, but they refused. Finally, I told them, 'All right, if you take that horse, you get nothing but that horse. It is enough.' I had something else to say, too, and I told Atsaçi I wanted to tell him something after we finished.

" 'What?' he said.

"I told him not to forget that he was married to two of my 'daughters' (they were daughters of my brother). In these words I spoke to him. 'If I accept these terms, and you insist on that horse, you can have it. But if you do, you will lose your two wives. I will take back my daughters from you. You are my son-in-law and yet you are not caring what you say; you are trying to get the horse I love.' [595] [602]

"Then Mangey Coat broke in right away. He said that Atsaçi wasn't thinking about what he was saying. He said they would agree to take another horse.

"That was what I wanted. Atsaçi was silent. He was ashamed. He was really older than I was and he had forgotten about being my son-in-law in that way. Then I asked him what he had to say to the agreement.

"He mumbled, 'Well, it's up to Mangey Coat. He is older than I am. It's up to him to have the say.'

"Well, I told them I was willing to do the right thing, so I gave them a grey mare, a bay horse, a good saddle and a gun. Later on that grey horse got to be a very good racer and won lots of money." [541]

Here is one of the few cases in which the *danger* of sending intermediaries appears. But ill-advised choice of counsel is a risk, even with us. Note also that a breach even of the levirate bites, though the brother-tie be purely classificatory; and that rights of the wife's "father," though but of the "father"-group, are available after marriage. 627x 602

[9] In strict form it was customary to ask for four different articles in damages.

1: Hoebel E-5 (1933) 1940 NO6 Comanche NO6

take action by the force of social opinion; yet he had small chance of succeeding.

It is true that his kin would avenge his death if he were killed in carrying out his social obligation to prosecute. Small comfort in that. What he sought was not death but an adjustment in accordance with his legal rights. Where the balance of prowess lies normally on the side of the wrong-doer in an individualistic system, the process of law will be checked. This is because the ultimate legal sanction is force, the very power in which the prosecutor may find himself shorthanded. If this prevails generally, then the foundation is sapped from under the structure of legal order. But if the power of the wronged party equals that of the transgressor, a different situation exists. A settlement can be effected through bargaining. Here the sociological principles of compromise are clearly operative: an avoidance of force to effect exchanges in terms of mutual concessions. John R. Commons writes, "Arbitration is never accepted until each party to a dispute is equally afraid of the other, and when they have reached that point, they can adopt something better than arbitration, namely, negotiation."[11]

Unconsciously operating on this principle, a Comanche prosecuted by himself only if sure of his own courage in relation to that of the defendant. But Comanche society took an important step forward in effecting an equalization of powers when the aggrieved was not strong enough to prosecute by himself. The aggrieved was allowed the privilege, apparently not customarily granted the defendant, of marshalling his kin and friends to aid him in seeking restitution. In many instances these partisans took over the complete responsibility of negotiations. In other cases, the aggrieved accompanied them on their mission, but refrained from entering the bargaining activities. In no single specific case did the defendant take recourse to similar reinforcements. It does not seem to have been his privilege. Consequently, the collectivization of the bravery of blood relatives and friends by the prosecutor may be viewed as a social mechanism whose function was to give added protection to the rights of the husband.[12]

This practice often allowed for such a show a force on the side of the aggrieved that the defendant could actually be cowed. Though this might seem unfair, there is more justice and stronger check to illegal action if it is

---

[11] J. R. Commons, *A New Way of Settling Labor Disputes* (American Review of Reviews, Vol. 23), p. 328. Commons' truth is an overstatement. Not "equally afraid," but "enough to make battle highly inconvenient," is more accurate.

[12] The only contradictory evidence to this is the statement by Post Oak Jim that once there was trouble over damages between a couple of groups fighting with rifles, "so I didn't get close enough to see much." The fact of rifles indicates that it is a late case.

1: Hoebel E-5 (1933) 1940 NO6 Comanche NO6

the defendant and not the wronged party who is thus intimidated. Accordingly, this occasional overbalancing of forces on the prosecuting side does not so much defeat the aim of law as would the alternative condition, and is socially more defensible. Nevertheless, as we shall see, abuse by the plaintiff could lead to repercussions. Defendants, too, were within the protection of the law.

A number of conditions entered into the matter of group aid in such endeavors. The "rightness" of the aggrieved party's case was a strong operative factor when it came to gathering his group. To participate in such a group if petitioned was a kinship responsibility, though not an obligation. It was rather reciprocity, in this case, which made the responsibility a reality. Theoretically any man could refuse to help a relative, but it was the better part of wisdom to go along with him. Who knew but what the day might come when each man in turn would need the help of the others? And there was material gain to be had by participation.

Brothers and friends who were called "brother" were those obligated to act for the aggrieved, if he called upon them. This obligation was fortified by a right to a share in the damages collected; the participants' right to a cut in the compensation took precedence over the aggrieved's. The ludicrous result was that sometimes a man's "lawyer" brothers got all, while he was left to contemplate the satisfaction of having seen the law through.[13] This is a stated principle, but does not appear in our case material. To be accurate, however, these "brothers" had more than a lawyer's interest, and a closer responsibility than that of other relatives was theirs. Through the institution of levirate they had a partial claim on the aggrieved husband's wife. They too were wronged. This claim could in itself give rise directly to occasional legal action. Hence their share in the damages was more than pay for helping in the procedure. It was a share in composition for a wrong mutually suffered. But why did the "brothers' " rights to the goods take precedence over the husband's? A hazarded explanation would be that it served as an inducement to reinforce the obligation the brothers held.

Or is it possible that a broader force was in operation here? The practice may be associated with prestige compulsions. It was more grandiose wantonly to kill a horse than to take one. It was more noble to reward one's helpers than to grab the take for oneself. The principal was under social compulsion to be noble. Is it a parallel to the rule of the raiding party that the leader should be the last to share?

[13] Bobby Burns, 'tis said, ruefully declared, "The Lawyers get the a' of it."

1: Hoebel E-5 (1933) 1940 NO6 Comanche NO6

HOMICIDE

MURDER AND RETALIATION

627 The description of proceedings thus far set forth reveals clearly enough that the native law made little effort to conceal the importance of coercion and force in its functioning. The Comanches, particularly, were a fighting people who did not fear violent action. To them *ability* to possess was "nine points of the law." Even so, it has been shown how far they had gone in modifying the primitiveness of this principle by setting up a legal mechanism of adjudication and compromise for certain offenses.

682 For murder, however, there was no adjudication or compromise in Comanche society. In the event of murder the *lex talionis* was invoked. The case was not closed until the kin of the dead man had taken the life of the murderer. There was no acceptance of composition as was the case with some other tribes of the plains.[1] Nor was there intervention and banishment pronounced by the chiefs as among the Cheyenne or the Omaha.[2]

602 682 Among the Comanches, where kin organization was weak, the principle of kinship liability was not potent enough to result in feud. In principle a simple retaliation was all that was required; the murderer must be the victim. There was no ruthless taking of life of whomsoever happened to be related to the murderer. The kin feeling was strong enough, however, to induce the kin of a murderer to do their best to protect him for some time. As long as vigilance was maintained, unless the murder led to hot-blooded vengeance on the spot, no attempt at attack seems to have been made. The avengers simply waited until time wore down the watchfulness of the protectors; then the avenging thrust was made.

There is but one case known to us in which the kin groups met in open clash. And that was a strange mix-up.

Case 13. Murder: Cooks Dried Meat vs. Püsku
Informant: Talker (Recorded by Jeannette Mirsky)

"Cooks Dried Meat had a wife. Early one morning he told her, 'We're going hunting.' After they had gone quite a way, Cooks Dried Meat told his wife to dismount. She did so. Then he took her to a tree and tressed her to it. He faced her and said accusingly, 'You and your uncle (a classificatory brother of her mother) are intimate.' The woman denied it. But he persisted, 'I saw you helping him fix his hair. You were looking for lice on his scalp.' With that he whipped her hard and then took her home.

---

[1] R. H. Lowie, *Primitive Society* (New York, 1920), p. 403.

[2] A. Fletcher and F. LaFleche, *The Omaha Tribe* (Report, Bureau of American Ethnology, vol. 27, 1906), p. 215.

1: Hoebel E-5 (1933) 1940 NO6 Comanche NO6

"That evening just before dark the wife left his lodge and went to the tipi of her uncle. She arrived just as he and his wife were finishing eating. When they had finished their supper, they asked what might be on her mind. 'I have come to carry tales,' she said. 'Go on,' he replied. 'Well, your son-in-law, Cooks Dried Meat, accused me of being intimate with you, and he whipped me badly.' Her uncle was indignant. 'The brute, the bad thing, the devil—you shall not go back to him.' His mother and father were living in the same tipi, so he asked the woman to stay there.

"A little later there was the sound of something outside, and a voice said, 'I have come for the person who is visiting you.' 'Go home!' the uncle shouted back, 'she is staying here.' It was fall and cool enough to have a fire and eat indoors. They went to bed.

"The uncle's tipi was at one end of the encampment; the husband's was at the other. Just at white dawn a voice shouted out from the tipi of Cooks Dried Meat. 'Get ready Pítsku (the uncle). Prepare yourself!'

"It stirred a terrible commotion. Everybody woke up and asked what was going to happen and angry voices were heard. Cooks Dried Meat strode forth accompanied by his father, the aged peace chief, Tongue, and a young man. They went towards the tipi.

"Close to that tipi was one of an old man who lived with his grandson. He stuck his head out and received an arrow full in the throat. As his relatives pulled loose the shaft they cried, 'We shall wipe Cooks Dried Meat out. We shall join Pítsku to do this. Then they fired and killed Tongue. The fight was on. Pítsku got badly wounded in the rump. Hard by was my mother-in-law's tipi—a big one. Into this Pítsku scurried for shelter. Next the son of Cooks Dried Meat was killed, making two men shot on each side. Cooks Dried Meat came to my mother-in-law's tipi to get Pítsku, but the old woman warned him away. 'You don't kill him in my tent,' she threatened. 'If you do, it will not be well for you. The man of this house is a great warrior and a strong medicine man. It will go ill with you if you shed blood in his tipi.'

"By that time a group of men had intervened. 'Stop it,' they ordered. 'It is enough that two men have been killed on either side. Stop.'

"Cooks Dried Meat then fled from the camp. He was chased by the grandson of the old man he had shot in the throat, but he escaped and never came back to the band. He moved away from it.

"Pítsku died of blood-poisoning. Tongue was the peace chief. If he had not taken his son's side, it would have been his duty to have stopped the fighting."

Other acts which to the Comanches were so heinous as to warrant lethal retaliation on the aggressor were the slaying of a favorite horse, and insulting conduct which was insufferable to the aggrieved. These factors appear severally in different cases, but are combined into one single complication in a famous Comanche case known to many informants. There are slight variations in the telling, but the main points of action remain the same.

1: Hoebel E-5 (1933) 1940 NO6 Comanche NO6

×627 they had to live apart on the outskirts of the village. The social sentiment 624 was there. A norm making a crime of parricide could have developed from it. But as it was, it remained not a matter for "legal" interference by society. Therefore murder was still essentially a wrong and only vaguely a [679] crime.

×627 In case 27, p. 94–95, a young warrior slew his mother's brother because 602 of black magic performed against his brother. The uncle was said to be putting a curse upon the youth for suspected adultery with the uncle's wife. Here were two intra-familial actions: the first, for a violation of marital rights; the second, a retaliation before the fact in anticipation of the death. In the words of the informant, however, "The quarrel was in the family, so no one else could take it up to do anything about it." This case sharply defies the supposed principle of inability of blood to proceed against blood. At the same time it resubstantiates the private nature of murder.

×627 Supporting and contradicting the hypothesis that action could not be 593 taken against an aggressor within the family, is a second case of parricide 682 in which Capture killed his father, who was a "captive white man who had 602 grown from boyhood among the Comanches." His father had remarried after his first wife's death. The new wife was young and beautiful—and indiscreet. She took her step-son as a lover. When his father got suspicious, Capture shot him to get him out of the way. Then he fled. His flight, however, led him into the vicinity of That's It's camp. That's It was a foster relative of the dead man—through his adoption into That's It's family. That's It called him "younger brother." That's It took a party of his kinsmen to confront the murderer. "Son," he said, "for one thing I have come. It is as it is—it is done (the deed). I am taking the woman and the horses." Then the informant explained, "That's It took the horses and the woman, not as a form of damages, because Capture was his 'son': you don't collect damages from a son. He did it as a punishment, because the woman meant more to the boy than anything else."

×627 Taking a group of kinsmen over to divest an erring relative of his ill- 602 gotten wife and horses was not collecting damages; it was punishing him! It had to be so, because one did not collect damages from a son. Is legal logic restricted to the civilized mind? One could not proceed against a kinsman, but one could punish him.

The truth seems to be that the "principle" itself rests on confusion. Where families or kin are the legal units recognized by the society as a whole, then *before the society as a whole or its officials* it may well be that "a group cannot proceed against itself." But there remains the self-regulation of the group. The Comanche instances show two things: that what happened

1: Hoebel E-5 (1933) 1940 NO6 Comanche NO6

inside the kin group was the business of nobody outside the group; and that inside the group, the way of handling a situation depended largely on personality and temperament.

627×
602●

PRIVILEGED HOMICIDE

One type of killing which was not murder was the privilege of the husband to kill his wife. This is a variant of the purely in-group character of in-group friction. For this there was no retaliation. It was the acknowledged right of the man, and no one would lift a finger to legal action. Not only was the position of woman largely that of chattel, but the chattel passed from the original family to the husband. In return the obligation to provide food for the father-in-law lay on the husband. Escape for the woman lay in absconding,[3] but the number of instances in which the run-away wife was slain or mutilated by the husband is notable. In the twenty-two cases of wife-absconding collected from the Comanches the woman disputed was killed by her husband in four. Three adulterous wives were killed by their husbands in twenty-three instances of discovered transgression. Thus in forty-five Comanche cases of marital infidelity, seven women were slain at the hands of the husband or his henchmen. This is one in six.

562
682
[684]

Though the sample is admittedly too small to be *statistically* significant, and is possibly biased through selection on the part of informants, it is not without significance that eighteen percent of the adulterous wives were killed. That the statistical proportion cannot be greatly in error is buttressed in the wry observation of Rhoda Bluefoot that the wives of her father and his brothers never ran away; they were afraid of what would happen, because their men were well known as fierce fighters.

That the kinship group showed no inclination to retaliate when a husband killed his wife—their blood relative—can mean nothing else than a true relinquishing of the kinship bond upon marriage in favor of a supreme marital bond. That a father had to beg his son-in-law not to harm his daughter who had erred, and even offered gifts that her husband would not harm her (see pages 101–102) proves this.

581
562
602

The fact of potential marriage through sororate rights did not, however, establish the legal right of a brother-in-law to kill his wife's sister. She was not yet his wife; therefore, not his for disposal—not even when the woman was *also* the wife of the slayer's brother, giving thereby additional *expectant* rights through the levirate. The Comanche captive, Lost, met his death for killing the sister of his wife, who according to She Invites Her Relatives, _____ was at the same time the wife of his brother.

587
562
682

[3] Women informants used by Dr. Mirsky held that household sabotage was the easiest way out. A woman could shirk her duty until her husband threw her out in disgust.

1: Hoebel E-5 (1933) 1940 NO6 Comanche NO6

000
586
606

was at the same time the wife of his brother. But when a son-in-law gave personal offense to a parent-in-law, it was possible to order dissolution of the marriage.

Case 17. Murder of Sister-in-law: Lost vs. his nephews
Informant: Post Oak Jim

x627
682
C02

"Once some white men caught some Indians and held them prisoners. Those that were left were short of food. There was a Mexican captive who went to a girl and said that if he could get a horse he'd buy something for them to eat with it. He wanted to take the best horse. The girl bawled him out. 'There are plenty of horses, and I don't want to take the best.' She said she didn't want to give it to this crazy Mexican. After that he wanted to make up again, but they sent him off. He was interpreter for the Indians at that time.

"The Mexican went up to his wife. He wanted to know where his bow and arrows were. He took them and went up to the woman who owned the horse and killed her. Four of her sons were gone. After she died, her people cried and cried, and buried her out on the prairie. All the rest of the Indians had it in for the Mexican, but they didn't know what to do about it. The Mexican was a medicine man and a war chief. The four boys got back. The others were crying for the dead mother. The boys told them to be quiet for a while. They said they were not going to cry until they finished everything. The Mexican's wife told him his nephews were back. His wife was the dead woman's sister. The sons did not eat. They got several men, and told them what they were going to do.

" 'We're just going to keep still about it for awhile. We'll find out all about it. This man is a medicine man, and we'll try to take away his medicine. Early in the morning we'll pack up and leave.' In the morning the men and the four boys got their guns and got ready to start.

"The Mexican had his horse tied up. There were eight men with the boys. The Mexican untied his horse, saying, 'They won't come.'

"His wife was all anxious and nervous. She said, 'Lost, what are you going to do? Your nephews are coming.'

"He said, 'I've no need to be on horseback to fight them. They are just like women.'

"They came around the tipi, calling, 'Come out, you are nothing but a coward.' As soon as he came out one of them shot him, and they went on. His wife didn't know what to do. He was dying; blood was just pouring out. There was one medicine man there, but he didn't have much power. The following evening he was doctoring Lost, but he died. The wife came down to camp the next morning. Nobody did anything to the boys. They had it in for him, killed him, and that was all. Lots of people were glad. He was real mean. Chew Up was the man who killed him."

It is not likely in this instance that the fact of Lost's being a captive laid him open to attack where a full-blooded Comanche would not have been.

1: Hoebel E-5 (1933) 1940 NO6 Comanche NO6

He was a medicine man and a ranking war leader, which meant that he was perforce a man of status, even among the tribal full-bloods. 627 x 682 602 ●

In spite of the legal right of a husband to kill his wife, it should be noted however, that from a general social point of view, a man who killed his wives too recklessly was considered mean by the people; yet if he were insensitive to such disapproval, and particularly if he were brave enough to maintain his status through *coups*, there was little to prevent him from being as free a Bluebeard as he wished—except that wives became harder for him to get.

Attempts of wives on the lives of husbands were rare. The one case, given by Talker, is interesting for its many facets, and significant for its outcome. It shows that given time to let the revenge feeling cool, coupled with a recognition of provocation to kill, certain murders might be overlooked.

Case 18. Murder: Wife destroys husband
Informant: Talker (Abstract of History recorded by Jeannette Mirsky.) 627 x 682 593

The husband had been abusing his wife in attempts to force a confession of unfaithfulness from her. One day when he had prepared a fire over which to roast her, she seized and stabbed him and cremated him on the pyre he had intended for her torture. Then she fled for many days to the west until she met Ute Indians. There she was adopted as a wife and lived for a season or two. Then she told her entire story, ending, "and then I threw his body on the fire that had been prepared for me. Because both my husband and I have many relatives on both sides, and because I feared a conflict between the two families, I started out so that there might be no trouble between the two families."

Later she escaped and returned to her people. She repeated the whole episode to the dead man's father, and as she finished, all her relatives burst forth in a great wail for the man whom she had slain. But there was no trouble. The dead man's father announced, "Because my son was so mean to her, and because I had tried to talk to him, and he would not listen nor heed my word, and because both our families are respectable, to do anything at this late date would be unbecoming."

Thus there was no feud, no retaliation.

ACCIDENTAL HOMICIDE

Though the Comanches were more rude than other Plains tribes in their failure to recognize composition for murder, they showed more perceptive discrimination than most primitives in drawing a clear line between murder and accidental homicide. Intent to assault was a necessary feature of murder. A clearly defined case illustrating this principle was given by White Wolf. 627 x 672

1: Hoebel E-5 (1933) 1940 NO6 Comanche NO6

The diplomatic game of threatening sanctions was played in Comanche law: there was much bluster, but we know of only two cases in which actual physical harm was done the sorcerer (aside from the planned executions above). One of these was a "lynching," the other a murder, but done within the family. In the case of No Bed, the sorceress whose story is recounted below, the attempted violence was circumvented. Indeed, so circumspect was the handling of sorcerers with mundane techniques, so much was it front without substance, that such a terrorizer as Looking After His Son could bully the would-be prosecutors into submission.

627 x
633
754

Case 24. Sorcery: ? vs. Looking After His Son
Informant: Eagle Tail Feather

"Looking After His Son was a boastful medicine man always talking about his power. Whenever he went among the people it was his boast that he could kill anyone within a vicinity of a quarter mile, should that person raise his displeasure. After all this big talk people began to get suspicious of him.

"One day a young man fell sick. People took to muttering about Looking After His Son. Rumors flew about until finally Looking After His Son heard that people were accusing him of the deed. He heard that the relatives of the sick youth were threatening to kill him.

"It was not long before a relative of the youth who lay ill came to call at the sorcerer's lodge. Looking After His Son welcomed him. 'Hello, friend,' he said. 'I am happy to see you here. Sit down. We will tell stories tonight.'

"At midnight the visitor made excuses to go. The medicine-man motioned him to keep his place. 'I have a certain question to ask. You must accept it,' he ordered. 'I understand your relatives are saying I cause them death. They are making threats at me. Now you look out. Before you leave here, swear that you will stop them, or else—. Well, I'll fix you for certain.'

"The man swore.

"Early the next morning, without stopping for breakfast, he sought out his kinsmen. He pleaded with them for his own sake not to offend the sorcerer further. They heard his plea, and deemed it wisest to acquiesce; they said nothing more about Looking After His Son after that." [602]

It was the opinion of the narrator that Looking After His Son was as guilty as guilty can be. Yet what could be done about it? Sorcery was the the affair of the relatives; they shirked it with cold feet. The sorcerer's bold front and the power behind it were his impunity.

A comparable outrage was recorded from Carrying Her Sunshade. It was a situation in which she figured as a girl, thus placing it shortly before 1860.

1: Hoebel E-5 (1933) 1940 NO6 Comanche NO6

absence. The Comanches knew the conditional curse for adultery and sorcery cases, and also had ordeal. They made no legal use of the latter; the former was not extended into general legal practice. This is more notable than the *absence* of either procedure. Nothing could more interestingly evidence the inertia in the way of diffusion or further adaptation of institutions *within* a single culture.

Papítsoin may be best called a joking ordeal. In the presence of others a joker (who could be anybody so long as his relationship to the butt of the joke did not demand avoidance) addressed another person of either sex. In an off-hand manner the remark would be dropped, "Well, and so I hear you have been having intercourse with So-and-so."

The usual reaction was indignant denial. If so, the joker picked up a bit of dirt between the fore-fingers and sprinkled it on the hair of his victim. This done, were the victim guilty of the sex conduct charged, the loss of all hair was supposed to result, and the victim would appear ridiculous in the eyes of all people. Or even more terrifying, if the jokester placed the dirt upon the tongue of the victim, guilt would be proved in loss of speech.

This is a practice which lives today and causes much mirth for the onlookers and terror for the party accused. In the summer of 1933 Skinny And Wrinkled told with great gusto how he had seen a woman running down the main streets of Lawton, Oklahoma, speeding as though pursued by the Holy Terror, which was in fact no more than a laughing young Indian with a pinch of dust between his fingers.

Non-submission to the test proves guilt even as does submission and the occurrence of the unfortunate consequences. This is ordeal in all its aspects of a supernatural test save the solemn setting and the presence of a dispute of interest-importance to the disputants. One would expect that in the event the victim of the joke were a married woman, and found guilty, her husband would perforce institute proceedings against the adulterer. Nevertheless, the assurance of informants is that it was never used seriously, a statement which is substantiated by the complete absence of any ordeal practices in the case histories of disputes which were collected.[11]

OATH

In the Buffalo Tongue Ceremony,[12] a very definite immunity from legal consequences for an unfaithful wife was observed. After a big hunt the

[11] The joking ordeal was unknown to the Shoshone. Its counterpart was found among the Cheyennes. This indicates a late acquisition for the Comanches.

[12] This ceremony is lifted from the sun-dance complex of other tribes. Its rarity among the Comanches is attested by the fact that no mention of its practice was made by informants used by the laboratory group. Dr. Mirsky recorded it independently.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

601 Thus we see that in spite of these and other exceptional situations the size of the group of relatives which may be established through any given line of relationships is fairly definitely limited. Actually, however, it is quite clear that a Comanche could almost always call every other Comanche by a relationship term of some sort or other, and usually did. Of course, with a system which is completely repetitive, such as this one, it is only necessary to establish relationships with one person in the group, find out in which direction the term goes if it is reciprocal, and all the rest of the relatives will fall into place. This must have been of great assistance in the old days to someone changing band allegiance. At the present time there is seldom any real difficulty in locating a common relative with anyone in the tribe. The actual origin of most of these relationships is naturally lost; usually they will be phrased as "no real relation" or, at best, an "old relation."

But one may speculate that many of them are actual old lines, whose common origins have been lost, but which continue to exist parallel to each other. [582] [184] Several examples could be cited of potential beginnings for such lines; thus one informant (T) was told by his older sisters of a line of "real blood relation" to his father, and he kept this line quite distinct among his relatives. He felt that this would be a definite bar to marriage with any of the people involved; yet his "great-granddaughter" through this line married his "great-grandson" through an older brother. Thus the younger children had forgotten, or ignored, this relationship entirely. The old man was quite obviously very disturbed when this relationship was pointed out to him; he himself had not thought of it specifically before.

The wide disparity between actual age and terminological generation between some of these systems of floating relationships suggests at least that they go back a good many generations. The most striking instance of this involved the other informant from whom a genealogy was collected (TY). She kept several lines distinct, all stemming from relationships which her maternal grandfather, a famous warrior (Red Young Man), had observed and she had 602 noticed, but which he had never explained. Two of these happened to converge 601 upon a friend of hers in the form of husbands, the first of whom my informant [551] addressed as "younger brother," and the other as "great-grandfather."

She also said that before acculturation into the white patterns, when the name-tabus were strong, parents would never tell children even in private more than one or two names of deceased people who were of importance in the family tree, and would do little more than indicate by what term one should call so-and-so, warning that it was a close relationship. It is easy to see how these children could grow up in ignorance of why they used certain terms, and not very aware of the closeness of the relationship, and thus pass on to their children little more than the usage of the terms.

Whether or not this is actually the origin of the majority of the relationships recognized is a matter for conjecture. In any case, we do find these very

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

many lines of relationship which each person traces, running back and forth through most of the people he knows, overlapping and coinciding very frequently. Naturally, the use of such a system involves many choices between two or more possible terms to be applied to some certain individual. The choices have often been made by one's parents, and are just adhered to; but in many other cases this is not so. It is especially true when one marries, for in this way a large constellation of new relationships is established through one's spouse. Usually, the choice is made, and this usage is continued thenceforward; if the connecting relationship is broken through death or divorce, the person may or may not keep the terminology established by it. Sometimes, the two alternatives are both kept alive, and are used interchangeably; operations of this sort make it easy to go one step further, and manipulate the terms of kinship in situations where there is no actual justification for some particular usage except expediency.

In most cases the choice is quite clear-cut: one relationship is closer than the other, and it is automatically used. Thus when T married his third wife, another woman whom he had called wife, or *hâipia*, and with whom he had been carrying on a joking relationship, became his sister. With the day of his marriage he began to call her "sister," and continued to do so, practically without exception, until his own wife died; the sister relationship was then abruptly dropped again. There are a great many such instances; this one is especially interesting because the reciprocal joking relationship, which had been avidly pursued, was terminated quite as abruptly as was the use of the term, and, with his wife's death, was at once reinstated; thus the relationship was conceived of both terminologically and behaviorally as existing quite apart from the person through whom it was made, and no restrictions of mourning were associated with it afterward.

By this same marriage, another woman who had been related as a sister through another "old relation" became a wife and *hâipia*, and started joking with her new-found "husband." They joked a good deal, but when she began to get the best of him, he would call her "sister," to remind her of the other relationship, and she would have to stop at once. A related situation is one in which, for example, a man's brother's wife, who had always called him "husband," and who was potentially his wife through the levirate, would start calling him by a sibling term upon the death of this brother, in order to indicate that it was not necessary for him to fulfill his obligation of replacing his brother as her husband. A fair number of such shifts were recorded, in various relationships where potential marriage situations existed. TY called her second husband's mother and her sister by the proper parent-in-law terms; but as they grew older they became blind, and she used to help them a great deal. To signalize this dependency they felt toward her, they began calling her "daughter," and she called them "mother." A daughter-in-law who gets along unusually well with her husband's mother is quite frequently called by the closer term of

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

602 601 daughter; in the same way, a girl who has been reared to a large extent by her grandmother, especially if she is an orphan, or illegitimate, will be called "daughter," and will reciprocate by calling her grandmother "mother." It is interesting to note that these relationships, however artificial they may be, are always consistent. A person will never use a special relationship term toward another unless this other reciprocates by using an appropriate term toward the first.

The closer terms of kinship which we have just seen substituted for more distant correct terms are also extended in their application to non-related or little-known people toward whom one wishes to show friendliness or respect. Thus a man will usually call a stranger "father," or "mother's father," depending on his age—this latter term is considered to denote the closest relationship, as far as warmth and dependence go, of the two grandfathers.

More formalized are such usages as the reciprocal joking which goes on between grandparents and grandchildren, which operates largely by means of their using various sets of kinship terms and then making jokes about their consequences; this will be considered in more detail in the next section. Also, if [572] two persons standing in a certain relationship to each other each have close friends of the same sex as themselves, these two friends may playfully adopt [195] parallel relationship terms toward each other. The terms in this case have a phonetic pattern slightly different from the normal usage.

Perhaps of the same nature is the custom whereby two young men may call each other *nīmīlī'-i?*, "our girl friends," to signalize some affair which they had with two girls who were friends; this usage is said sometimes to continue throughout life, though no instances were recorded.

In these examples it is evident that the universal applicability of kinship terminology and the choices of relationships which are presented, together with extensions of its usage outside of genealogically traceable relatives, make this system a remarkably flexible tool in the hands of its users. With the selection of terms there is, apparently, a selection of behavior patterns also, always followed consistently by both parties involved.

The Comanche seem to follow the usual custom in regard to more distant relationships, wherein the behavior patterns found in the immediate family become gradually less distinct and demanding, and more permissive in nature, providing opportunities for fulfilling them to any degree which the person wishes. Yet some aspects of behavior appear to persist very strongly; this is well exemplified by the alternation of sister and joking relationships already mentioned.

It remains now to see what these behavior patterns are which are associated with the relationship terms, and to what extent there is a distinct pattern for each term.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

572 196 *hâic* only if he wished to emphasize that for one reason or another he did not consider him a relative at all, and TY used *ïï'·i?* in much the same way. All informants agreed that sibling terms provided a much closer and warmer way of expressing the relationship, but used the friend designation in casual conversation as being more informal. No attempt is made to distinguish which variety of "friend" the individual is; this is assumed to be known to anyone who might be present. It is possible that some of the confusion in this regard is a product of contact with white people, many of whom have *hâic* as practically the only Comanche word in their vocabularies, and use it as a greeting without discrimination; but this does not seem to be the most important factor, for there is every indication that this lack of clear definition of the application of the term is aboriginal. However, the use of *hâic* as an equivalent of "sweetheart" does seem to have been a translation of the American "girl friend," "boy friend."

This lack of clarity makes it practically impossible to formulate any even approximate behavior pattern associated with this term if, indeed, any exists; such opinions as were offered in answer to general questions were obviously references to one or both of the focal relationships, in spite of the fact that the term is seldom applied to own brothers, and the formal friendship, when it did exist, was far from including all the individuals who were regularly called *hâic*. An analogous situation is apparent in our own culture where "friendship," is conceived of as a warm and unselfish relationship, expressive of all our more worthwhile values, and yet one considers hundreds of people "friends" toward whom one is willing to display little more of this ideal behavior than a cheery "hello."

The feminine counterpart of *hâic*, *ïï'·i?*, operates in about the same way, and its usage is often no clearer. Whether the institutionalized friendship ever existed here, and if so, what its basis was, is not apparent. Inasmuch as the affairs of women between themselves were generally considered to be pretty trivial by the dominant warriors of days gone by, it is almost certain that no friendship among them could have achieved the public recognition which the *hâic* relationship did. It is not clear whether women recognized the especially close friendships which obviously existed among them as being a comparable phenomenon, though they presumably did.

602 *Discussion.* It is obvious from the foregoing brief discussion of behavior that there is a definite and distinctive pattern associated with each relationship situation, and that each relative has a number of more or less clear-cut functions toward the individual. While these patterns are unquestionably identified to some extent by the use of kinship terms, it cannot be said on the basis of this alone that the terms are themselves the primary factors in determining behavior; a close group of relatives might well function in much the same way even if their relationships were not terminologically conceptualized.

But the real test can be applied when the terms are used outside of the

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

fairly immediate family to identify more distant relatives, or in unusual situations. Such data as have been presented with each discussion of relationship above are not entirely conclusive. The gradual diminution of behavioral association with terms applied to progressively more distant relatives is far from denying to these terms any behavioral content, for it would hardly be expected that all people called, for example, "brother," would be treated equally intimately; but it is important to note that these patterns become increasingly optional and that they are followed only if it is agreeable or convenient to do so. Among other things, without going directly counter to an established usage, two individuals who do not wish to follow its consequences may often find another suitable relationship to recognize, or even invent one.

602 ●

Stronger evidence, perhaps, for the association of behavior with the mere words which identify relationships can be found in the various manipulations of terms and in the complications involved in changes of relationship described in the preceding section on application of the terminology.[14] The situations in these cases arise solely on account of such associations, which are sometimes very specific, and at others very general. Although we must here recognize that only a very small or diffuse segment of behavior is involved, and that the patterns are far from playing the dominant role in an individual's life which those of closer relationship do, nevertheless it is clearly the kinship term alone which evokes and signalizes the complicating attitudes and relationships.

An interesting reversal occurred in T's life. His father lived a very long time and had many wives and children. When he was quite old his last wife had, as her only child, my informant (whose legitimacy I could naturally never question). As a result, his half-siblings were far older than he; and the early death of his mother left him dependent upon them for such family life as he had. While he was still very young, his older brothers all died from sickness or in battle, and one of his closest male relatives, who took him into his family for some time, was the son of one of these brothers, and was thus also terminologically T's son. It was stated that this man was old enough to be his father; whether or not this rather remarkable fact was true, he was old enough to act *in loco parentis* to my informant, and did. Insistent questioning did not reveal any behavior which could have been associated with T's terminological position as father. A similar reversal, which involved the son of one of his sisters, was made simpler by the use of a reciprocal "uncle" term; I was not able to discover whether he even considered this an inversion at all. These cases clearly show that where a conflict arises between the behavior normally associated with a term and the behavior expected within the family group, the latter is completely dominant.

In sum, then, we see that there is a certain, often minimal, amount of

[14] Hoebel (1940), p. 57, provides a similar example in which a man disrupts another's levirate claims by reminding the claimant that he is his son-in-law through a classificatory brother, and hence should be careful lest he lose his wives.

9: Gladwin E-5 (1940) 1948 NO6 Comanche NO6

●602 behavior and of course affect which is associated with the calling of any individual by a relationship term, and which arises directly from the use of the term, even where the behavior pattern has no functional validation. In some very unusual cases this association may be completely eliminated by some conflicting factor, but more frequently the conflict is resolved by the substitution of some other term whose behavioral concomitants are more suitable. The opportunity for such manipulation of the terminology is dependent to some degree upon how distantly related in the classificatory category the individual in question is from the person who stands in the focal relationship to the speaker. To be effective, these substituted terms must be used reciprocally and consistently by all parties involved. The use of kinship terms for the Comanche is never a one-way affair; the relationship which the application of a term signalizes always demands that the person addressed reciprocate with the appropriate complementary term, and generally also with the behavior thus implied. Otherwise the initial usage is meaningless.

YALE UNIVERSITY
NEW HAVEN, CONN.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

113 CATLIN, GEORGE
1945 *Illustrations of the Manners, Customs, and Condition of the North American Indians.* 5th Edition, 2 Vols. London.

EGGAN, FRED (Ed.)
1937 *Social Anthropology of North American Tribes.* Chicago.

HOEBEL, E. A.
1939 Comanche and Hjkandika Shoshone Relationship Systems. *American Anthropologist,* n.s., 41: 440–457.
1940 *The Political Organization and Law-ways of the Comanche Indians.* Memoir 54, American Anthropological Association.

KARDINER, A.
1945 *The Psychological Frontiers of Society.* New York.

KROEBER, A. L.
1934 Yurok and Neighboring Kin Term Systems. *University of California Publications in American Archaeology and Ethnology,* 35: 15–22.

RADCLIFFE-BROWN, A. R.
1930 The Social Organization of Australian Tribes. *Oceania,* 1: 34–63.
1935 Kinship Terminologies in California. *American Anthropologist,* n. s., 37: 530–535.

STEWARD, J. H.
1938 Review of *The Social Anthropology of North American Tribes* (Fred. Eggan, Ed.). *American Anthropologist,* n.s., 40: 720–722.

[pp 95- end not processed]

128 a brief ethnographic account of the old naming customs will first be given.

553 6.1. Comanche personal names were bestowed in a variety of ways and frequently in rather casual fashion. In rather sharp contrast to our practice, a person could in his lifetime successively bear several different names, or be known by several different sobriquets at any one given time.

551 Little distinction was made between male and female names, although some plainly did refer to male or female characteris-

[553] tics. Women's names, however, tended to be more permanent.

While almost from birth an infant could be called by a pet name or nickname which was often kept until adolescence, a child could also simply be called by the word for *boy*, pihia?, or *girl*, nai?A. It was not uncommon for a person to be called by a status term designating age and sex, or by a kinship term, in lieu of his personal name.

553 However, a youngster would usually receive a given name in early childhood, although one informant stated that he was not given such a name until he was ten years old. A child's parents in modest

551 ceremony would customarily call in an

[553] elder or two to relate stories and choose as a name some word descriptive of an incident or character in the tale. A name could also come from some incident in a person's life which subsequently came to be associated with him.

In some instances a child was named after a parent, relative or other person, but because of the taboo against using the name of a dead person, only if he or she was still alive. Or, alternatively, a boy could, in familiar European fashion, be called "son of so and so". Only in the latter case was there anything comparable to the use of paternal surnames.

553 Nicknames derived from physical peculiarities or temperamental idiosyncrasies

551 were frequently bestowed and could be given at almost any point in the life cycle from babyhood on. In line with the insti-

[602]

[p. 243-B]

553 tutionalized joking relationship, such nick-
551 names were usually given by an in-law,
602 and more frequently than not were derogatory or had some sexual or obscene reference.

553 A young man would often receive a new name after he had proven himself on his first war party. Or, a young warrior, who aspired to the name of an old man who had been a famous warrior, could ask permission of the oldster to become his namesake. The old man might then put the youth to the test of equalling a feat well remembered by the people. If the youth met the test, the old man would be compelled to give up his illustrious name and use a former one.

533 In earlier times names along with other
787 gifts were bestowed through visitations by
776 supernatural spirits who were sought out
[178] by fasting and dreaming in secluded places. This practice, however, seems to have been in eclipse as early as 1870, although many older Comanche still bear names given them
551 by their guardian spirits. Thus, Comanche
181 names may be characterized as varied and highly individual, a fact which reflects Comanche emphasis on the worth and variety of the individual personality.

551 6.2. By a study of the 2394 Comanche
177 names on the January 1940 census rolls
[161] one may trace, from the older through the younger generations, the adoption of the White system of patronymics and the consequent displacement of the native naming patterns described above. This shift was accomplished largely within the past seventy-odd years dating from the early reservation period. Rollcalls, the taking of vital statistics and census data, intermarriage with Whites, rationing, attendance at schools and churches, orthodox baptisms, trading, and the casual bestowal of personal names by the Whites were all factors instrumental in the change.

551 Although the rolls were called every three
177 days, the men by name and the women and
657 children by count, as early as 1875, the first formal census was taken in 1890 and names of Indians "had to be definitely decided

[p. 244-A]

29: Hoebel E-4,5 (1933) 1969 NO6 Comanche NO6

and actually in many, a girl had no formal voice in the choice of her husband. Her brothers gave her away in exchange for a consideration. The takers were usually older and established warriors and hunters who had the goods. In the Comanche ideal such arrangements made for the best marriages. But they were marriages in which the woman was at the mercy of her husband. Working against the stability of such marriages was a strong current of romantic idealism among the young. The ambition of the adolescent girl was to be a *naiβi*,[5] i.e., a beautiful maiden with lustrous, black hair hanging in long braids, and dressed in a fine fringed buckskin dress. The young bucks for their part strove to attract the attention of the girls by playing the role of *tuiβitsi*: "a handsome young man who looks good on a horse." Wife-absconding was really an escape in which a frustrated wife sought a more romantic match with a daring warrior.

Comanche elopements were invariably linked to a war party. The man in the case would be going on a raid with his friends, and he would make an assignation with the woman to go along. It was a way provided by custom to violate the marriage rights of the rightful husband as defined by custom and sustained by law! A nice example of internal inconsistency in the ways of a culture.

When a woman and her lover took off with a war party, two courses were open to the jilted husband. He could mount in hot pursuit in the hope that he could overtake them before they reached enemy territory. Or he could bide his time until they returned from the raid. In enemy country he could not press his suit; here all Comanches had to stand shoulder to shoulder. Aside from this, he could institute his action wherever he might be able to confront his tortfeasor. He might take along some compatriots—brothers, real or putative—to strengthen his courage and his arm, if need be. A real man, however, went alone. It was not necessary for him to gather witnesses, for a Comanche legal action was in no sense a trial. Questions of evidence rarely, if ever, entered. The wife-stealer, or even the adulterer, had no desire to conceal his deed; his aim was to flaunt his prestige in the face of the challenged husband.

If he followed the dictates of decorum, he politely addressed the defendant as "brother." The defendant replied in kind. Did not Comanche brothers share their wives? Syllogistically the reasoning runs:

> Men who share a wife are brothers.
> This man has assumed a share in my wife.
> Therefore, he is my brother.
> (But he is going to pay for the privilege!)

The immediate goal of the prosecuting husband was to get *nanewɔkɔ*, restitutive damages. As an opening gambit he placed his demands high,

[5] Phonetic symbols are used as in the International Phonetics System.

682 It was an absolute privilege-right, which not even her family would move [593] to challenge.

On the other hand, for one Comanche male to kill another was never 682 a privilege-right, even when applying force to an over-stubborn defendant. 627 Any willful killing required a revenge killing of the slayer. Here was the fatal weakness of Comanche law, as indeed of so much primitive law. The culture provided right ways of procedure and defined the substance of 602 tortious acts. But the primacy of the kin group came to the fore whenever 682 a prosecutor felt he had pushed negotiation as far as it would carry and then had taken recourse to arms. The kin of the defendant whom he had 627 killed did not accept the killing, although general public opinion may have held that the victim had it coming to him. The Comanche kinsmen took revenge on the prosecutor regardless of the rightness of his original grievance. In enforcing the law he lost his life, a victim of *lex talionis*.

However much Comanche law fell short in this respect, custom [518] remedied the defect in another. Blood-revenge killing was only of the first killer and retaliation did not lead to feud. The kinship principle, while extant, was nevertheless weak among the Comanches, and general fighting within the tribe was not to be countenanced when there were always outside enemies to be confronted. The killer, and the killer alone, had to die. There it stopped. No religious sanction, no tribal authority, was necessary to suppress the feuding tendency. Custom was sufficient restraint, and in this the Comanches were fortunate, for thereby they escaped the self-renewing curse that plagues so many primitive law systems.

Willful killing of a man's favorite horse was an act akin to murder, 685 especially if the horse had been bequeathed to him by a best friend. Re- 627 taliation was taken not in killing the favorite horse of the transgressor but [825] in slaying the transgressor himself. A favorite horse had a legal personality and was equated with a human being. Consequently, no further blood revenge followed, for things were already equal: a man for a horse.

787 Every Comanche male at one time or another went on a vision quest in search of power. He did not abase himself before the supernatural spirits or masochistically mutilate and torture himself to arouse their compassion. 776 Nor did he weep before them to arouse their pity. Unlike the tribesmen 789 of the Plains to the north, he assumed that the spirits were generally benign toward him; they needed no coaxing to share the benefits of their power with him. If he fasted and waited in a lonely place, they would help him. 776 Nor did they interfere in his daily living except as they put conditions on the use of the power they gave him. A Comanche had to observe no super- 784 natural tabus save those that went with his own personal medicine. Under Postulate VIII[A] most Comanche medicine men used their powers to help 756 the people. They cured and used their medicine to bring success in war 789 and the hunt. They even, for a contractual consideration, helped others

A [See category 181, p. 69--Analyst]

/page 31 continued/

C K 129 personally but not the society. As the job takes more and more time it also begins to cut into my field time to a rather dangerous extent. So what started out as seemingly an asset has rapidly become the millstone around the neck.

C K 129 122 Our decampment from Lawton to the little hill town of Medicine Park has done much to offset my identification with Lawton. Informants are happy to visit with us in Medicine Park but would not do so when we were in Lawton. We have been able to keep up continuous contact C K 124 123 with two families, fairly good contact with two others, and then there are various older people that our introductions take us to see for specific information. It is not easy to keep good contacts with a representative cross section due to the fact that our major introductions come from just two families. While neither family cares who we consort with in the other tribe they are a little careful to see that we deal with approved people in their own tribe. Ergo we know the Kiowa Christians and the Comanche peyotists which is something of an unequal situation for good comparisons.

Kinship Organization and Behavior, Settlement Patterns and Mobility

C K 601 178 602 While it is possible to trace the breakdown of the tribal and band organization and the traditional authority of the chiefs etc., it is, so far, almost impossible to gauge changes in the kinship organization. The work done in this area, however, has pointed out some differences between the Comanches and Kiowas. Unfortunately, no firm conclusions may be reached without statistical evidence which is not forthcoming.

C K 592 K 361 592 Since the settlement on individual allotments, the Comanches and Kiowas have taken the great step toward living as nuclear families. As far as I can determine, the Kiowas still live in such a manner that the members of the extended family have allotments fairly close together. Most of the Rowell, Quetone, and Horse families are located to the north of Meers. The Rowell family alone, including half siblings, is settled along the Meers to Porter Hill road. There are, of

/page 31 continued/

K 361 592 C 361 K [361] 484 601 602 [493] [491]

course, /32/ some members living further away and many of the younger people between thirty and twenty years old are either away at school or off on relocation. Nevertheless, the homesteads remain in definable clusters. The Comanches seem to be more dispersed by comparison. This would seem to be the case even in those instances when the original homestead of 1901 was adjacent to the allotments and homes of the other family members. People frequently move to purchased allotments. This impression may be due to coincidence in the few samples I have but there is some verification for my impression from the Wermeys who run the Indian Arts and Crafts Cooperative in Anadarko. According to them the Comanches are far more scattered and more difficult to locate than the other tribes in the area with whom they deal. Although both the Kiowas and Comanches took allotments on the sites where they were camped at the time the law was passed (coincident with band affiliation) the Comanches seem to have broken up this pattern more than the Kiowas or the other tribes further to the north. Perhaps the original band affiliations were less cohesive due to their comparatively large size. In spite of the fact that more mapping may be done it will be virtually impossible to get enough typical samples to tell the true story. The same problem rears its ugly head in respect to the actions of the younger generation. We have no simple means by which to determine the extent and nature of the dispersion of the younger generation. Although the relocation program does not appear to be having significant results other factors (see first report) seem to be moving many of the young people into towns.

As much as the settlement patterns may be changing, effects that such changes have, or may have, upon the kinship organizations are interfered with to some extent by the increased mobility offered by the automobile and the constantly improving road network. This mobility gives the dispersed extended family more opportunity to keep up contact via frequent visits by auto. But here again it is virtually impossible for the single investigator to gather sufficient data.

/page 32 continued/

C K 464 Within a small peyote group will exist enormous differences in distance to be travelled. Two cars in a family will frequently distort the picture. The occupation of an individual will to a great extent determine the amount of travel time available regardless of the amount of interest in visiting, peyote, or pan-Indian affairs in general. Also, individuals who must commute long distances to a steady job will rack up high speedometer readings without spending much time visiting, etc. In fact, I have even observed some Comanches with widely dispersed kin and friends spending more time visiting than many Kiowas whole families live within a two mile radius. In spite of this, I still feel that the travel pattern of the Comanches and Kiowa is considerably different from that of the neighboring whites. Just how it can be measured or accurately described, however, I do not know.

C K 601 829 177 602 Turning now to the kinship organization, it is safe to say that the same complexity due to individual variations is to be found. Moreover, the attitudes toward change color the data given by informants. In this way the father of a family that has kept its kinship patterns (relatively speaking) may be convinced that the old system has disappeared entirely. The converse may also be the case.

C K [562] [191] The concept of the ideal pattern has been preserved by all the /33/ older people I have met, Kiowa, Comanche; mixed bloods, Christians and Peyotists. The pattern does not seem to be directly affected by inte-marriages except insofar as the mixed marriage may change the dominant language of the family. The actual behavior

C K 601 177 602 [161] [582] [588] [684] patterns are changing in many respects. One of the chief factors is the small size of the tribe (Comanche in this instance) which has forced marriages to occur within the exogamous group to an extent. Strictly tabu marriage have occurred both among the Kiowas and Comanches but these are still recognized as wrong and the participants are stigmatized. The sanctions are not as sever as the traditional ones, however.

30: Levy E-5 (ca. 1957) 1958 NO6 Comanche NO6
Oklahoma
Kiowa NQ15

/page 33 continued/

C K 601 178 602 [191] Among the Kiowas and Comanches, regardless of the community (peyote or Christian), or the degree of intermarriage, certain things are held in common. Old and middle aged people retain the kinship organization as recorded by the earlier workers in this field, almost to the letter. What variations I have found are scattered and are probably due to individual variation. Within the younger groups the degree of retention would seem to be variable with the amount of the native language that is still spoken and not with the nature of the home (mixed blood, white or inter-tribal; Christian or peyote; active or inactive in Indian affairs etc.). Although the younger age groups are especially anxious not to appear "primitive" to the Whites and will not admit knowledge of the language, the kinship system, or other earlier traditions, they often as not have the knowledge and do know to a greater or lesser extent what the kinship system is. In other words, it is the extent in the change of language which most directly seems to relate to the change in the kinship system. The observed factors causing acculturation would appear to operate upon the kinship system via the language medium. For example, that a young person lives in town and works with Whites and perhaps does not identify strongly with tribal tradition, etc., is not sufficient to bring about a change in his knowledge of and conception of the kinship organization in itself. If, however, he loses his grasp of the language or he does not speak the native language with his children then the whole system may be lost to those individuals. I have made the acquaintance of several young men who are strongly identified with Indian traditions but, due to the fact that the native language was not spoken much in the home, have no knowledge of the kinship system nor have they made any attempts to learn it. I have looked into white-Indian mixed marriages and the grown children of same and find that as long as the native language can hold its own in the household the knowledge of the kinship system will be retained. In view of this one may speculate on the effect that integrated schooling in Oklahoma will have on the

C K 601 191 179 602

/page 33 continued/

C younger generations in the next few years. It would not be surprising
K that the cumulative changes in Indian way of life during the past
601 hundred years shall only be reflected in the changing kinship in one
191 lump at one time. This rather than a corresponding curve representing
197 gradual change.
602

As virtually all of the active Comanches and Kiowas are bilingual, they use English kinship terms when speaking to the Whites. As there is no serious reason for the Whites to come to grips with the tribal systems this accomodation is satisfactory whether the terms have been correctly applied or not. Thus an adequate and comparatively effortless accomodation has been made by the Indian which serves to insulate the operating kinship system from the pressures inherent in the culture contact.

C /34/Except for the aged, all the individuals I have had the oppor-
K tunity to observe are becoming more lax in adhering to prescribed be-
602 havior. In those cases where behavior patterns are performed it is
198 not taken "as seriously" as in the old days. Much of this is due to the loss of adequate sanctions as well as to the disappearance of many of the underlying cultural reasons for the traditional behavior patterns.

At first glance it appears that the Kiowas have maintained more of the traditional behavior patterns than have the Comanches.
K This may or may not be so. The Kiowas still practice (in varying de-
602 grees of laxity) mother-in-law avoidance. There is still much of the
606 old respect-avoidance between siblings of the opposite sex. But as
593 the Comanches never had these avoidances to start with (where they
198 did it was to a much lesser extent) it is difficult to determine
C changes in the Comanche behavior patterns. John Pahdoponi insists
602 that even those sibling avoidances which did exist in the past are
593 gone today. But John is predisposed to see the old order as having
198 been destroyed, and that in its entirety. The traditional Comanche allowed the brother and sister to speak face to face, to eat at the same table although not at adjacent seats and to ride together

/page 34 continued/

C (a la automobile) but not on the same seat. John maintains that this
602 no longer holds for his own children and that brothers and sisters
598 will even dance together. However, I have never seen any of his
178 children break these strictures.

C While preadolescents frequently break tabus, this is to be
K expected from the examples of indulgence afforded in the earlier days.
858 The preadolescent had not yet come of age and was not considered
178 responsible or even capable of comprehending the total network of responsibilities and strictures which he would have to follow as an adult.

C The range of recognized kin seems to have shrunken considerably
K for those younger than about 45 years. This is probably due in part
602 to the fact that the ideal marriage cannot be adhered to and the
178 resultant mix ups tend to confuse the younger generations (in its
C turn due to a less clear settlement pattern?). Claim relationships
K also seem to confuse the younger people who do not wish to be bound
608 by them. To be so bound would certainly restrict the choice of a
[502] marriage partner to the nth degree although I do not think this is
C a motivating factor in the minds of the individuals concerned. The
K [178] young people do not make claim relatives as did their parents. On the other hand, a claim relative of the parents or grand parents who keeps close contact with the family will be recognized and honored
C by the young people. The practice of inheriting a claim relative
K [428] after an older person's death is most often considered a great nuisance.

Factionalism

C The conflict in primitive societies coming into contact with
K technologically superior cultures, between assimilationists and tradi-
177 tionalists has been proposed elsewhere (Redfield 1953). I have been
186 attempting to determine whether this tension may be observed today and, if so, whether it can be helpful in coming to understand the factionalsim of the Plains Tribes.

30: Levy E-5 (ca. 1957) 1958 NO6 Comanche NO6
Oklahoma
Kiowa NQ15

/page 37 continued/

C one of the younger separationists is drawing closer to the Peyotists
665 to gain support. The result is that in order to maintain any semblance
795 of unity and brotherly love in the Peyote meeting John and his
"brothers" must withdraw from the political arena. /38/ Whether
C this withdrawal is successful may be questioned. I also wonder
K how real the brotherhood of the Peyote community really is. But
795 such is the ideal and it determines actions to an extent. One must
C also ask how strong the claim relationship of "friend" and "brother"
K is. It is certainly a formality in many instances. But I have heard
608 of cases where the formality was kept up in spite of many aggravating
572 situations only to be discarded after a tribial act on the part of
one of the parties involved.

C Granting that generalities are premature, some things do
K strike me as peculiar to the situation, that is some reactions to
665 rivalries, competition, or whatever, are not what one would expect
of our culture. The present factioning may be traced back in part
to a rivalry between two young men. One a Comanche the other a
C Kiowa. It has been noted that much of the lining up of the sides is
K determined by kinship and claim relationship ties. Something small
[602] may grow into something big. Similar situations have been recorded
[609] for other plains tribes in other periods. What does impress me is
the tendency to splinter, to withdraw. Rather than a cooperative
effort on the part of two or more opposition groups ending in decisive
action, there is instead a multiplying of opposition groups, less
C action and more talk. This, in spite of the fact that the frustrations
K of contact with the white world might also be expected to develop a
177 degree of concerted reaction to annoying problems. In any event
665 further investigation must ask whether the present situation is one
of long standing and if so whether it is due to the pressures of the
White culture and/or the nature of the native culture itself.

32: Gilles O,X-3 (1902-c.1910) 1974
NO6 Comanche NO6
Oklahoma

In Comanche society, once a woman left her father's camp she must of necessity become a wife. There was not another nook or cranny of Comanche society into which she could crowd herself. There were no avocations open to her. Prostitution and concubinage were not countenanced, and the enslavement of an unattached Comanche woman by another Comanche was completely unthinkable. (An example of the length to which a Comanche's obligation to respect the rights of other Comanches extended may be seen in the situation of the semiwild dogs that infested every camp. These dogs were not pets—they were parasites. But they could be neither killed nor mistreated. They were relatives of the coyote; and since the coyote was a relative of the Comanche, one had as well abuse another Comanche as one of these semiwild dogs.)

Provision for widows was made in this manner: if a man was killed, or if he died from disease, his wives became the wives of his brother or brothers, and his children became the children of his brother or brothers. There was also a relationship known as blood brotherhood, in which two men mingled their blood together. Such a blood brother could succeed as the husband of his deceased blood brother's wives.

During the more than five years when I was among the Comanches and was dealing with them, I became sold on polygamy as a way of life for them. They made it work. After twenty-six years of peace, there continued to be a much larger number of women than men. Though all but three of the old warrior group that I knew had more than one wife, and a number had three or more, I knew of no single man in that age group. Neither were there surplus unattached women. And women must have outnumbered men in the age group of forty-five years and over, by considerably more than two to one.

As nearly as I was able to discover, the multiple wife situation was a development rather than the result of a plan. A man did not decide he was going to have two, three, or more wives and go out and purchase the number he had decided upon. He started modestly, as a young warrior, with the purchase of one wife. Then as he prospered, gained a reputation, and accumulated a horse herd and maybe a baby or two, the work would become too heavy for one wife. Obviously they couldn't secure a hired girl, so they looked around and probably decided between them who would make a satisfactory and agreeable number two wife. When possible, a younger sister of the number